

State of California Department of Justice

California Witness Relocation and Assistance Program Fresno County District Attorney's Office

**Review Period:
January 1, 2006 to September 30, 2009**



**Division of Executive Programs
Office of Program Review and Audits**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>SECTION</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Independent Auditor's Report on Applying Agreed-Upon Procedures	1
Findings and Recommendations	3

INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT ON APPLYING
AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

TO: Chief Deputy Attorney General

We have performed procedures, which were agreed upon by the Department of Justice, the California Witness Relocation and Assistance Program (CAL WRAP), and the Office of Program Review and Audits (OPRA), solely to assist the CAL WRAP in evaluating the Fresno County District Attorney's Office (FCDAO) assertions that they have followed the policies and procedures of the CAL WRAP and have claimed only reimbursable costs for the period January 1, 2006 to September 30, 2009.

Procedures were performed to verify that the FCDAO:

1. Implemented the program in a manner consistent with the CAL WRAP guidelines.
2. Claimed costs that were reasonable and allowable for reimbursement under the CAL WRAP guidelines.
3. Claimed costs that were supported by source documents (cash receipts, rental receipts, rental agreements, invoices, payroll registers, time sheets and/or other relevant documents).
4. Returned or credited rental and utility deposit(s) to the CAL WRAP when a case was closed or terminated, or the witness moved to a different location.
5. Claimed per diem costs consistent with the rates allowable with the CAL WRAP guidelines.
6. Complied with the 25 percent (25%) match required of all expenditures incurred on or after January 1, 2008, unless the CAL WRAP waived the required local match.
7. Returned unused funds to the CAL WRAP for closed or terminated cases.

We have performed the procedures in accordance with attestation standards established by the International Standards for the Professional Practice of Internal Auditing. The sufficiency of these procedures is solely the responsibility of the specified users of the report. Consequently, we make no representation regarding the sufficiency of the procedures for the purpose for which this report has been requested or for any other purpose. In performing the agreed-upon procedures, certain matters came to our attention that are reported in the Findings and Recommendations section of this report.

We were not engaged to nor did we perform an examination, the objective of which would have been the expression of an opinion. Accordingly, we do not express such an opinion. Had we performed additional procedures, other matters might have come to our attention that would have been reported to you.

This report is intended solely for use by the CAL WRAP and should not be used by those who have not agreed to the procedures and taken responsibility for the sufficiency of the procedures for their purposes.

Andrew J. Kraus III, CPA
Director
Office of Program Review and Audits
January 7, 2010

Staff: William Wong, Audit Manager/Auditor

FINDINGS and RECOMMENDATIONS

Finding

FCDAO claimed the following excess temporary and semi-permanent meal and incidentals costs:

Case #	Category of Expense	Period (if multi-year audit)	Amount
	Temporary and Semi-Permanent Meal Allowance		\$ 3.00
	Temporary and Semi-Permanent Incidentals		58.00
Total			\$ 61.00

Criteria

Charts B and C in the *CAL WRAP Policy and Procedures Manual* contain the appropriate daily and monthly allowance rates for temporary and semi-permanent meals and incidentals.

Recommendation

The CAL WRAP should require that the FCDAO return \$61 to the CAL WRAP.

Division Comments

CAL WRAP requested and received \$61 from FCDAO for excess temporary and semi-permanent meal and incidentals costs.